

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 19 are pending in the application, and that claims 7-11 are allowed, claims 6 and 19 are objected to, and claims 1-5, 12-15, 17 and 18 are rejected.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claims 6 and 19 have been rewritten as independent claims to include the limitation of their base claims. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 6 and 19 (as well as previously allowed claims 7-11) are in allowable condition.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §112

At item 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 15 has been amended to remove the antecedent basis problem identified by the Examiner. Applicant submits that this overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §102

In item 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,388,679 to Kluck et al. ("Kluck"). In item 4 on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113807 to Nason et al. ("Nason"), and in item 5 on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,621,438 to Kamimura ("Kamimura").

The Present Invention

The present invention is a computer apparatus, display apparatus, display control apparatus, storage medium, program transmission apparatus, and display control method that enable visibility to be improved without decreasing ease of use.

While there are various embodiments disclosed and claimed, each embodiment includes, as a basic element, the ability to designate a portion of a screen being displayed on a display unit and then, without changing the resolution of the underlying screen, changing the resolution of the designated portion thereof. Thus, an underlying screen, such as a desktop, having a first resolution, can have displayed overtop of it a portion of the same desktop, at a resolution that is better or worse than the resolution of the underlying desktop. Various additional aspects are claimed, e.g., the ability to increase the size of the overlying designated display portion so that it covers the entire underlying screen, the ability to display the display

resolution information for each of the screens, and the like. However, as indicated above, each of the claims have, in common, the claiming of the separate display of the designated portion of the underlying display.

U.S. Patent No. 6,388,679 to Kluck et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,388,679 to Kluck et al. ("Kluck") teaches a method and apparatus for the simultaneous display of different viewing areas on a computer video display monitor so that a user sees them as displayed at different resolutions. The technique of Kluck is directed to the designation of different display resolutions based on the use of different software programs within the display area of the display monitor. Thus, for example, IBM's Lotus Notes might be displayed at one resolution while, over the same underlying viewing area, IBM's Lotus Word Pro could be displayed at a different resolution.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113807 to Nason et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113807 to Nason et al. ("Nason") teaches a method for creating and accessing a graphical user interface in the overscan area outside the area of the display normally utilized by the common operating system. Using the technique of Nason, a secondary user interface can be displayed in the border area (called the "overscan") beyond the standard screen display area. Additional video display memory is allocated for the overscan area, and the image written to this additional video display memory is then displayed by the system alongside the original display area.

U.S. Patent No. 5,621,438 to Kamimura

U.S. Patent No. 5,621,438 to Kamimura (“Kamimura”) teaches a display device and a generally transparent input tablet having an input surface placed on a display surface of the display device for outputting a pointing coordinate which is a coordinate on the input surface pointed by a user’s finger or an indicator. Basically, Kamimura teaches a touch screen device whereby two coordinates, a first touch point and an extended projection point, are identified when a user touches the screen. This provides additional control over the operation of the touch screen by the user.

The Cited Prior Art Does Not Anticipate the Claimed Invention

The MPEP and case law provide the following definition of anticipation for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §102:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP §2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

The Examiner Has Not Established a *prima facie* Case of Anticipation

As noted above, the present claimed invention includes the designation of a portion of a display screen image and the ability to display the designated portion, which is less than all of the underlying display screen, atop the underlying image with a display resolution different from that of the underlying image (e.g., claim 1, “...a display unit control logic for displaying a designated portion of a screen being displayed on said display unit that is less than all of said

screen being displayed on said display unit, with a display resolution of said display unit changed, when a prescribed event is generated by said event generator.”; claim 5, “...said display control section displays a portion of said image, said portion being less than all of said image, on said display unit at said display resolution that is different from said desktop resolution.”).

None of the cited references teach or suggest these features. Kluck teaches that multiple programs may be opened, with different programs being designated using different display resolutions. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kluck of designating a portion of an underlying screen, and then displaying that designated portion at a resolution higher than that of the underlying screen.

Nason teaches the use of a border area around a main screen, an area otherwise unused, to display additional information to a user. Again, like with Kluck, nothing in Nason teaches or suggests the designation of a portion of an underlying screen, and then displaying that portion, which is not the entire underlying screen, in a resolution different from that of the underlying screen.

Finally, Kamimura is directed to touch screens and the use of a pointing method to indicate various portions of the screen that are considered for manipulation. Nothing in Kamimura teaches or suggests the designation of a portion of an underlying screen, and then displaying that portion, which is not the entire underlying screen, in a resolution different from that of the underlying screen.

Without such teaching, or suggestion to modify their disclosures to result in the claimed invention, none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest the claimed invention, and thus it is improper for the claims to be rejected either under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103, based upon these references. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In item 7 on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kluck in view of Nason. In item 8 on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,008 to Winter or U.S. Patent No. 6,700,569 to Hubert. In item 9 on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura in view of Winter or Hubert, and in item 10 on page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,167 to Van Cruyningen.

The Examiner has not Established a *prima facie* Case of Obviousness

As set forth in the MPEP:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally

available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

MPEP 2143

Applicants have addressed the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with respect to Kluck, Nason, and Kamimura in the arguments presented above with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 102. More specifically, there is neither a teaching nor a suggestion in any of these three references of the designating of a portion of an underlying screen and then the display of the designated portion in a different resolution than that of the underlying screen.

The addition of Hubert, Winter, and/or Van Cruyningen fails to provide such a teaching or suggestion as well. Neither Winter nor Hubert nor Van Cruyningen teach or suggest these claimed features, nor does the Examiner assert that they do. Accordingly, it is improper to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Hubert, Winter, or Van Cruyningen, either alone or combined with each other or with Kluck, Nason, and Kamimura. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-4, 13, 14, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Allowable Subject Matter

In item 12 on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 7-11 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional claim fees in the amount of \$176.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-0563. A Credit Card Payment Authorization Form is enclosed authorizing the payment of the Extension of Time fee (\$430.00). The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted

October 14, 2004
Date

Mark D. Simpson
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
2600 ARAMARK Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189